



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,522	12/08/2000	Neta J. Amit	2210	1989

7590 05/01/2008
LAW OFFICES OF ALBERT S. MICHALIK, PLLC
704 - 228TH AVENUE NE
SUITE 193
SAMMAMISH,, WA 98074

EXAMINER

SHEIKH, ASFAND M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/01/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner notes the amendment filed on 12/10/2007 has been entered. The examiner notes claims 1-28 remain pending for examination, with claims 29-30 being cancelled.

Please note: The examiner examining the instant application as changed. The new examiner of record is Asfand M. Sheikh, the group art unit has not changed.

With respect to the amendments made to the independent claim. The examiner notes new grounds of rejection have been established therefore this action is made final.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 on art have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3627

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35

U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The examiner notes the term "to which of one or more of the first event request and the second event request the event instance corresponds" found in the independent claims is indefinite. The examiner is confused with the respect that there might be MORE than the first and second event requests? This phrase is unclear, appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 and 16-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,604,093 (Etzion et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,956,800 (Kametani) and U.S. Patent No. 5,321,837 (Daniel et al.).

Regarding **claim 1**, Etzion et al. discloses a system for notifying clients of events of an event instance (see column 17, lines 15-20), comprising: a first trigger engine configured to register event requests (see Figure 2, step 40), including first and second event requests; **[claim 2]** the data indicative of the event instance is provided in an event object (see column 8, lines 15-19); **[claim 4]** communication is over a network connection (see Figure 1); **[claim 5]** the first trigger engine includes at least one data structure (see column 12, lines 20-29); **[claim 6]** the first trigger engine is client; **[claim 7]** at least one of the event request corresponds to a job (the events

Art Unit: 3627

perform jobs over a given time schedule); **[claim 8]** the first trigger engine is associated with a job scheduler component (each event is controlled by initiators and terminators); **[claim 10]** the job scheduler component includes at least one data structure (Table 1); **[claim 11]** the event-triggered criteria include a time event (each event is controlled by initiators and terminators); **[claim 12]** the event-trigger criteria include a job event corresponding to the completion status of at least one other job (complex events include multiple events that occur at different times); **[claim 13]** the event-triggered criteria are arranged as clauses of atoms, each atom corresponding to a request (see column 8, lines 58-60); **[claim 14]** communication by the first trigger engine is via a reliable protocol (inherent); and **[claim 16]** the first trigger engine includes a recovery process (it is inherent that time values are reset after each event is completed).

Etzion fails to disclose a second trigger engine, wherein the second trigger engine registers multiple event requests that are grouped with similar requests into a base request and wherein the second trigger engine is configured to communicate with a first trigger engine to receive a registration of a single base event request and further receive notification of an event instance. Etzion discloses the system reacts to the

Art Unit: 3627

situation by notifying a user of the system that the situation has occurred (col. 17, lines 16-19)

Kametani et al., on the other hand, teaches output of combined data (see at least, col. 4, lines 7-18) from a first processor (col. 6, lines 33-43 and claim 1) to a second processor (col. 6, lines 33-43 and claim 1) which receives the registration of a single base event (col. 6, lines 33-43 and claim 1) and further the second processor communicates data back to the first processor (claim 2). Further the examiner notes a instance of the single base event is received at Kametani, in the form as in instruction (col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 6). The examiner notes the processors act as engines and work to determine a single base event (e.g. macro instruction) and further contain analogous functionality.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Etzion et al. with output of combined data from a first processor to a second processor which receives the registration of a single base event and further the second processor communicates data back to the first processor, as taught by Kametani et al., in order to reduce overall execution time and gain the benefits of high speed processing (Kametani et al., col. 3, lines 32-38).

Etzion et al. in view of Kametani fails to disclose a second trigger engine, wherein the second trigger engine registers multiple event requests that are grouped with similar requests into a base request.

Daniel, on the other hand, teaches a second trigger engine, wherein the second trigger engine registers multiple event requests that are grouped with similar requests into a base request (event group 27) (col. 2, lines 19-54; col. 3, line 54 - col. 4, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Etzion et al. in view of Kametani with registers multiple event requests that are grouped with similar requests into a base request, as taught by Daniel, in order to effectively, efficiently and cost reduced management of computer system's event streams (Daniel, col. 1, lines 60-61).

Regarding **claim 18**, the Examiner takes Official Notice that is old and well known to use an access checking mechanism.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Etzion et al. with access control as is well known in the art, because installing access control within a system provides the security necessary to insure the protection of enterprise data.

Claims 19-28 are directed to a method of using the system of claim 1, wherein the combination of Etzion et al. in view of Kametani and Daniel et al. discloses the method as described above in detail for the system.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable o U.S. Patent No. 6,604,093 (Etzion et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,95 6,800 (Kametani) and U.S. Patent No. 5,321,837 (Daniel et al.), as applied to claim 1 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,485 to Baber et al.

Regarding claims 15, Etzion et al., Kametani and Daniel et al. substantially discloses the claimed invention, however, it does not explicitly disclose the use of message queuing as the means of communication between the first and second trigger engines.

Baber, on the other hand, teaches the use of message queuing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to include message queuing, as taught by Barber, to enable message exchange between application (Baber, col. 1, lines 22-26), thus allowing a message sending process to operate very quickly (Baber, col. 1, lines 29-30).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asfand M. Sheikh whose telephone number is (571)272-1466. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8a-4:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan M. Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
3627

Asfand M Sheikh
Examiner
Art Unit 3627

/Asfand M Sheikh/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627

April 27, 2008